



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/755,782	01/05/2001	Yoon Kean Wong	PALM-3532.US.P	3206

7590 06/05/2003

WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO LLP
Third Floor
Two North Market Street
San Jose, CA 95113

[REDACTED] EXAMINER

CHEN, CHONGSHAN

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2172	

DATE MAILED: 06/05/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/755,782	WONG, YOON KEAN <i>M</i>
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Chongshan Chen	2172

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 March 2003.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.
 - 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
 - a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

This action is responsive to communications: Amendment A, filed on 26 March 2003.

This action is made final.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.
2. Claims 1-3, 8-10 and 15-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shakib et al. ["Shakib", 5,752,025].

Regarding to claim 1, Shakib discloses in an electronic device having a database of records of different categories, a method of displaying information comprising the steps of: receiving an indication from a user that selects a first category type of said different category types (Shakib, col. 3, lines 38-45, "By creating a categorization table into a quantity of data records with data organized under heading which can be expanded or collapsed, users can quickly tailor the display to focus on important information");

indexing a table with said first category type to obtain a first sort field for said first category type, said table associating each category type of said different categories with its own sort field (Shakib, col. 7, lines 1-4, "As mentioned previously, a major advantage of using a sorted index 12 is that other indices may be created using different fields or a different order of fields as the sort keys");

sorting records of said first category type into an order that is determined according to said first sort field to produce a first list (Shakib, col. 4, lines 50-59, "one advantage of using indices for sorting the data records is that the same body of data may be categorized quite differently depending on which data fields are chosen as sort keys or the indices ..."); and

displaying a portion of said order on a display screen of said electronic device, wherein said displayed is formatted automatically with information from said sort field on the left-hand side of display screen as view by said user, wherein by selecting sort filed said user controls said in which said records are displayed (Shakib, col. 3, lines 23-64).

Shakib does not explicitly disclose wherein a sort field for each category type is under user control, wherein records are sorted into an order that is determined according to said sort field and wherein by selecting said sort field said user control said order in which said record are displayed. However, Shakib discloses the system will allow the user to change the way the objects or other information is viewed and the user may create a customized view (Shakib, col. 1, lines 24-67), which means the user has control over how the information is sorted and displayed. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to control a sort field for each category type under user control, wherein records are sorted into an order that is determined according to said sort field and wherein by selecting said sort field said user control said order in which said record are displayed in order to focus in on relevant information. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to control a sort field for each category type under user control, wherein records are sorted into an order that is determined according to said sort field and wherein by

Art Unit: 2172

selecting said sort field said user control said order in which said record are displayed in order to focus in on relevant information.

Regarding to claim 2, Shakib teaches all the claimed subject matters as discussed in claim 1, and further discloses a method as described in Claim 1 and further comprising the steps of: receiving another indication from said user that selects a second category type of said different category types; indexing said table with said second category type to obtain a second sort field for said second category type; sorting records of said second category type by said second sort field obtained to produce a second list; and displaying in list order a portion of said second list on said display screen (Shakib, col. 3, lines 23-64, col. 7, lines 1-4).

Regarding to claim 3, Shakib teaches all the claimed subject matters as discussed in claim 1, and further discloses the electronic device is a palm-sized computer system (Shakib, col. 6, lines 22-23).

Claims 8-10 and 15-17 are rejected on grounds corresponding to the reasons given above for claims 1-3.

3. Claims 4, 11 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shakib et al. ["Shakib", 5,752,025] in view of Eagle [6,226,739].

Regarding to claim 4, Shakib teaches all the claimed subject matters as discussed in claim 1, except for explicitly disclosing the electronic device is a wireless telephone. Eagle discloses the electronic device is a wireless telephone (Eagle, col. 4, lines 4-5). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the method of Shakib with the method of Eagle in order to install the device in a wireless telephone.

Claims 11 and 18 are rejected on grounds corresponding to the reasons given above for claim 4.

4. Claims 5, 12 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shakib et al. ["Shakib", 5,752,025] in view of Daleen et al. ["Daleen", 6,493,722].

Regarding to claim 5, Shakib teaches all the claimed subject matters as discussed in claim 1, except for explicitly disclosing the database is a database of contact information comprising records each having fields defining a name, an address and a telephone number. Daleen discloses the database is a database of contact information comprising records each having fields defining a name, an address and a telephone number (Daleen, col. 6, lines 34-36). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the method of Shakib with method of Daleen in order to store contact information.

Claims 12 and 19 are rejected on grounds corresponding to the reasons given above for claim 5.

5. Claims 6, 13 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shakib et al. ["Shakib", 5,752,025] in view of Freund et al. ["Freund", 5,809,497].

Regarding to claim 6, Shakib teaches all the claimed subject matters as discussed in claim 1, except for explicitly disclosing assigning a default sort field for each category of said table; and allowing a user to define a particular sort field for each category of said table. Freund discloses assigning a default sort field for each category of said table; and allowing a user to define a particular sort field for each category of said table (Freund, col. 13, lines 62-65). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the method of Shakib with the method of Freund in order to sort database.

Claims 13 and 20 are rejected on grounds corresponding to the reasons given above for claim 6.

6. Claims 7, 14, and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shakib et al. [“Shakib”, 5,752,025] in view of Ramaley [5,995,940].

Regarding to claim 7, Shakib teaches all the claimed subject matters as discussed in claim 1, except for explicitly disclosing user depressing a designated button on said electronic device. Ramaley discloses user depressing a designated button on said electronic device (Ramaley, col. 13, lines 18-19). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the method of Shakib with the method of Ramaley in order to select categories.

Claims 14 and 21 are rejected on grounds corresponding to the reasons given above for claim 7.

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments filed on 3/26/03 regarding claims 1-21 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

As per applicant's arguments regarding “Shakib does not show or suggest a method of displaying information for a database of records of different categories disclose wherein a sort field for each category type is under user control, wherein records are sorted into an order that is determined according to said sort field and wherein by selecting said sort field said user control said order in which said record are displayed” have been considered but are not persuasive.

Art Unit: 2172

Shakib discloses the system will allow the user to change the way the objects or other information is viewed and the user may create a customized view (Shakib, col. 1, lines 24-67), which means the user has control over how the information is sorted and displayed. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to control a sort field for each category type under user control, wherein records are sorted into an order that is determined according to said sort field and wherein by selecting said sort field said user control said order in which said record are displayed in order to focus in on relevant information.

Conclusion

8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Rebane (6,539,392) discloses a system and method for data collection, evaluation, information generation, and presentation.

Lui et al. (6,487,569) disclose a method and apparatus for organizing notes on a limited resource computing device.

Ferrel et al. (6,199,082) disclose a method for delivering separate design content in a multimedia publishing system.

9. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO

Art Unit: 2172

MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Inquiry

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Chongshan Chen whose telephone number is (703) 305-8319. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday (8:00 am - 4:30 pm).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kim Y Vu can be reached on (703)305-4393. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 746-7239 for regular communications and (703) 746-7238 for After-Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703)305-3900.

CC

May 30, 2003



JEAN M. CORRIELUS
PRIMARY EXAMINER